DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 038 883 FL 001 382

AUTHOR	Rupp, Theodore H.
TITLE	Unresolved Problems in the Teaching of Foreign Languages.
INSTITUTION	Pennsylvania State Modern Language Association.
PUB DATE	69
NOTE	9p.; Paper presented at the Fall Meeting of Pennsylvania State Modern Language Association, Chatham College, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, October 1968
JOURNAL CIT	Bulletin of the Pennsylvania State Modern Language Association; v47 n2 p91-99 Spr 1969
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.55
DESCRIPTORS	*Articulation (Program), Curriculum Design, Educational Coordination, Educational Problems, Elementary Education, Fles, Graduation Requirements, Higher Education, *Language Instruction, *Language Learning Levels, *Modern Languages, *Program Design, Secondary Education, Student Placement, Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

Language teaching problems from elementary to graduate schools, identified by a series of questionnaires and centering around problems of program articulation, are described. The lack of bona fide FLES programs is noted. Problems of placing FLES students at the junior high school level with different training, the proper time to begin second language study, and the duration of language programs are discussed. Considerable attention is directed to college level problems including the nature of course content in view of the declining foreign language requirement. Freshman placement practice is also considered, and teacher training at the graduate level is examined. (AF)

from the Bulletin of the Pennsylvania State Modern Language Association, Vol. XLVII, No. 2, Spring 1969.

ED038883

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

UNRESOLVED PROBLEMS IN THE TEACHING OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES*

Theodore H. Rupp
Millersville State College

Two years ago I was asked to contribute a chapter to a book on language teaching to be published by the Philosophical Library. My chapter was to be about the articulation of language teaching or continuity for the learner from elementary school through graduate school. I agreed to do the chapter, and it appears in the book which came out this spring (1968) entitled simply *The Study of Foreign Languages,* edited by Joseph S. Roucek.

As a basis for my study I devised three different questionnaires. The first, divided into three parts for the elementary, junior, and senior high schools, went to public school districts in Pennsylvania; the second, to all types of colleges in the state; and the third, to universities scattered around the country. The returns brought me quite a wealth of information, but because of limitations of space I was required to stay strictly within the confines of my subject, and in my discussion I could do little more than merely cite statistical evidence of spotty performance in articulation, continuity, and coordination in the field of foreign languages on all levels.

My purpose here is to share with you some of the examples of confusion which my questionnaire brought to light. Some of the confusion is wide-spread, some of it less so. All of it is honest and results from such causes as lack of clearly-defined objectives, lack of understanding of the psychology of language learning, lack of financial resources, lack of conclusive research, lack of public commitment to languages, lack of a philosophy of language study, and other lacks you may think of. Nevertheless, by describing the disarray which exists and by identifying the problems we hasten the day when the unresolved problems find their solutions.

Let us start with the elementary school. The biggest problem here, of course, is the fact that despite all the evidence of experience and experimentation over the past fifteen years that the ideal time to start teaching the child to speak a foreign language is in his early years, there is still only a relative handful of bona fide FLES programs in operation in Pennsylvania. When I say "bona fide", I mean a program starting no later than third grade and continuing through sixth, meeting five times per week for at least twenty minutes each time, with a teacher well-trained in the language possessing a couse of study and a syllabus, a program offered to all the children in each of the grades and articulated with a program in the junior high school. My survey showed that there are schools where FLES does not begin until sixth grade, where FLES classes meet only twice per week for fifteen minutes, once per week for thirty minutes, and one hour per week after school, where only the gifted participate, where no courses of study exist, where the teacher is competent to do no more than play tapes or records or turn on a televised course, and where children who have had three or four years of a language go into a junior high that has no foreign language offerings at all. Though it is difficult to assess blame for the maddeningly slow progress of FLES toward nationwide acceptance, we high school and college teachers, who besides the children themselves have the most to gain, must in our apathy and inertia accept a major share of the responsibility.

(cont. next page)

* This article was read as a paper at the Fall meeting of PSMLA, Chatham College, Pittsburgh, Pa., October 1968.

FL 001 382

On the junior high school level the picture is even more clouded. Some begin a language in seventh grade, some in eighth, some not until ninth. Some schools have one 45-minute period per week, some one 50-minute period for grades seven through eight, some two periods per week ranging anywhere from 45 minutes to 90 minutes in length, some three periods from 24 to 50 minutes in length, some four periods from 25 to 50 minutes in length, and some five periods from 25 to 50 minutes in length. In districts having a FLES program some junior highs permit all the FLES-trained children to take the foreign language, while others exclude the slower ones. Though some schools coordinate their language program with the elementary school and offer a continuing development of the oral-aural skills, others deemphasize these skills in favor of grammar and translation. One of the most wide-spread practices is to consider the ninth grade as the first year of "serious" language study, any previous years of FLES and/or junior high being more or less written off as "exploratory" or "conversational". Instead of being provided a track of their own, children with previous language experience are put in with beginners, and since frequently the teacher is preparing them for a grammar-translation-oriented senior high program, their oral-aural skills are allowed to deteriorate. And all too frequently these children, who are accustomed to the lively give-and-take of the audio-lingual methodology, are bored, lose interest, and become language drop-outs.

What are the chief problems on the high school level? According to my survey, the greatest dilemma of the high school teachers is where to place the emphasis in their teaching, especially where their college-bound pupils are concerned. This dilemma is reflected in the lack of any clearcut pattern in the response to the question: "What do you think the colleges expect you to emphasize most in preparing your students for college FL courses?" A significant number did not even attempt to answer the question. Yet the majority said in answer to the question on how they determine where to place the emphasis that they are guided principally by the College Entrance Examination Board reading tests, which pay no attention to the oral-aural skills. On the surface the teachers would appear to be using good judgment, since the majority of colleges surveyed are still using the C.E.E.B. reading test scores for admission and placement. However, the lack of communication between the college teachers and the high school teachers is apparent in the fact that the majority of the college teachers think it is the primary job of the high school to teach their students to speak and understand the foreign language, college board reading examinations to the contrary notwithstanding. The college teachers are especially critical of what they consider to be the failure of the high schools to teach the students to speak with an acceptable accent and with grammatical correctness. On the teaching of comprehension of the spoken language opinion was less well-defined, but a majority, albeit a bare one, thought that the high schools are failing here, too.

An ironic twist in all of this is that while my survey shows that the high schools are practically unanimous in advising their college-bound pupils to take at least three years of the language in high school (the majority recommending four!), about half of the college teachers questioned think two years are sufficient. If these misguided college professors are the same ones who blame the high school teachers for doing a poor job of teaching their boys and girls to speak with an acceptable accent and grammatical correctness, the high school teachers have a perfect right to insist on being shown how it can be done in two years.

The high school teacher's dilemma is further complicated by the fact that the college teachers expect the high school product to have done considerable reading, that a substantial portion of the reading matter be what is termed "literature", and that the student bring with him or her at least some small degree of literary appreciation. No doubt most high school teachers would want to teach some literature anyway, for their college major and their graduate studies were probably literarily oriented, and---let's be realistic---dialogues, pattern practice, and lab drills can eventually become pretty

(cont. next page)

deadly for both student and teacher if unrelieved by something a little more intellectual in nature. However, the problem is to find the time to do all the drilling and practice required for an acceptable accent and grammatical correctness (and the language laboratory, valuable as it is, is not in its present stage of development the magic panacea many of us self-deludingly wanted it to be) and still have time left for literature in the three years the majority of the college-bound students take. And I should interject here that there are still hundreds of high school graduates entering college having had only two years of the foreign language and these one or two years behind them. In fact, my survey shows that the majority of the high school students do not have a foreign language their senior year, a situation resulting in no small handicap when they take up the language again in college. To return to literature, I shall only suggest in passing the difficulties of teaching Racine, Cervantes, or Goethe to classes of thirty and forty whose entertainment has always been television, not books, in an age when literature is considered by many to be a relic of an out-moded past.

On the college level my survey turned up an imposing array of problems, some of relatively long standing, others of recent vintage. One which appears to be producing current alarm is the presumed threat to the foreign-language requirement. As evidence of this alarm I have recently received through the mail in the form of a bulletin published by the Modern Language Association an announcement of a meeting of department chairmen at the MLA annual meeting in December, at which time Mills Edgerton of Bucknell will chair a panel whose topic of discussion is to be "The Threat to the Foreign Language Requirement." In his one-paragraph statement of objectives Professor Edgerton states that he, Arno Lepke, Sanford Newell, and Edward Sullivan "will form a panel to initiate discussion of (1) the probability that foreign language degree requirements will be subjected to intense scrutiny at a great many colleges in the near future, and (2) the danger that the requirements will be reduced or abolished altogether at many institutions. The group will discuss the reasons for this situation and will suggest that we must, as a profession, convince our colleagues in other disciplines that experience of foreign language and culture can be transmitted in formal instruction on the college level in such a way as to constitute a desirable component of an undergraduate education. The group will also suggest specific arguments in favor of our position that may be more persuasive than the reiterated, unconvincing assertions of the obvious cultural value of the study of foreign languages. We must debate openly and frankly the issues raised by our colleagues and by students."

At the present time, according to my questionnaire, eighteen of the forty-one colleges responding require a foreign language for graduation on the part of all of their students. Where it is a matter of the students in the liberal arts curriculum the requirement is one hundred per cent. What, however, does the requirement amount to in terms of semester hours? The answers given here were quite difficult to correlate, since the requirement can be met in so many different ways.

Some colleges allow a student to fulfill the language requirement for graduation on the basis of superior scores on the College Board entrance examinations, thus exempting him from further language study. Others specify six hours or two semesters and allow a beginning course to count in the total. A number specify twelve hours but allow credit for the six-hour elementary course as part of the twelve. A minority requires the passing of an introductory literature course. Several require the passing of a competency examination, in some instances based merely on reading ability, in others based on the four skills. The practice of the great majority at the present time, however, is to require demonstration on the part of the student of competence equivalent to that which is normally acquired after completing the six-credit, second-year college course. For the most part the student demonstrates this competency by receiving a passing grade in each of the two semesters of what is generally called the intermediate course.

(cont. next page)

Though the foregoing represents the present situation, enough of my respondents added comments to convince me that Mr. Edgerton and his committee are not just crying "Wolf!" In some instances the figures reported represent a reduction of previous requirements, resulting from recent faculty curriculum studies. In other instances our colleagues state that the language requirement is undergoing re-evaluation in the context of a faculty movement to "liberalize" the curriculum or make it more "flexible" by excising as many requirements as they can. Thus, like the animals in La Fontaine's "Les Animaux Malades de la Peste", the faculty in righteous wrath descends upon the foreign language department, cast in the role of the poor little ass, guilty of the heinous crime of a six-hour requirement.

In spite of a growing national--or international--trend to give the students what they want (and this is not all bad), such faculty action is possible only because of the confusion which exists as to why there should be a language requirement in the first place. At the worst, a minority of faculty considers it only as some kind of stumbling block or barrier which either--depending on what side of the fence you are on--happily prevents the dunderhead from obtaining a college degree or unhappily stands in the way of the bright-but-linguistically-disadvantaged. The vast majority of the faculty labels the languages "tool subjects" and calls us "service departments", giving us to understand that about all they expect of us is to teach their majors to be able to decode a sampling of the current written materials in their field. At the best, a minority of the faculty, while recognizing the "tool" value of a language--and not just the ability to read but also to speak it--in addition recognizes the intrinsic intellectual value of a college course in the literature and civilization of a foreign country and the necessity for such an experience as part of the baggage of the college graduate. Until somehow these various objectives can be reconciled on the college campuses, the foreign language requirement will continue to be a bone of contention, and the foreign language faculty will continue to occupy an uncomfortable, defensive position.

The second biggest problem is that of the placement of incoming freshman in the proper course. About half of my respondents use the College Board achievement test in reading for this purpose, and about half of these also use the listening test. It is ironic that we as college teachers should be telling our high school colleagues that we expect them to be teaching their students to speak and understand the language and then we appear to be ignoring these skills in placing them in our college courses. The fault is not altogether ours, however, for a goodly number of the colleges using the C.E.E.B. reading test state that they would like to require the listening test, too, if it were made more easily available to high school students. As to the cut-off scores for entrance into the intermediate course, the multiplicity of different scores reported, indicating a great disparity of standards, makes tabulation difficult, but the median score on the reading test is 480, with the lowest score being 350 and the highest 700.

Those not using the College Boards determine placement by one or a combination of the following: the MLA Cooperative tests, locally devised tests, number of years of the language in high school, high school grades, recommendations from high school teachers, the reputation of the high school, and S.A.T. verbal tests in English. One college reports, as follows: "To place the students at the appropriate level we use the C.E.E.B. scores in language achievement tests and in the S.A.T.-Verbal and also the scores in the Advanced Placement Program, plus their school records. We also weigh the Listening Test score in order to evaluate the students' linguistic proficiency." A table then follows made up of three columns: Years of Study in Secondary School, Achievement Test Scores, and Placement, in sequence of courses to fulfill degree requirement. According to this table, a student with zero to two years of secondary school study who makes below 430 on the achievement test takes the introductory course. A student with four years of previous study, making between 600 and 700 on the test, takes the fourth-term course.

This college is exceptional in its refinement of the placement process, yet, as is no doubt

(cont. next page)

the case with most colleges, it is obliged to make provision for "any necessary adjustments in the placements during the first two weeks of the term." Until a nationally-standardized battery of achievement tests measuring all we expect the high schools to teach and easy and inexpensive to administer becomes widely available, most of us will continue to grope in the dark, figuratively speaking, in the crucial and sensitive area of placement. And our intermediate course, for want of an adequate screening process, will continue to be the heterogeneous catch-all which makes it the most difficult of all to teach.

Another major problem on the college level seems to be what to teach--that is, on what aspect of foreign-language study the greatest emphasis should be placed. According to my survey, the colleges are in general agreement that the greatest part of the time available to the high school teacher should be spent in teaching the four skills, with about twenty-five per cent of the time going to speaking, twenty per cent to understanding, fifteen per cent to reading, and ten per cent to writing, the remaining thirty per cent being equally divided among formal grammar, civilization, and literature.

The survey shows that the high school teachers agree with the college teachers that their primary mission is indeed to concentrate the bulk of their time on the four skills, differing only in spending five per cent more time on the understanding phase (twenty-five per cent instead of twenty). Thus, the high school teachers claim to be spending half of their total time on the audio-lingual skills. Yet in answer to the question: "Of the phases you consider most important in high school teaching which one is most neglected or poorly taught in high school?" a majority of the college teachers named the speaking phase, and second in the voting was understanding the spoken language. In answer to the questions: "Do you think the high schools do a satisfactory job of teaching their students to speak with an acceptable accent?" followed by "To speak with grammatical correctness?" the college teachers were relatively definite in replying in the negative to both questions.

Hence, the situation is this: The college teacher expects the high school graduate to arrive in his classes with a certain degree of competence in speaking and understanding the language which, in the estimate of the college teachers, he or she does not possess; the college teacher is thus torn between teaching what he thinks the high school should have taught and what he thinks is the business of the college to teach. Some refuse, some try to compromise, but most college teachers, being reasonably sensible, will, though perhaps grudgingly, take the student from where he is and not from where he ought to be. If we were dealing only with prospective language majors, the problem would not be so acute, for there is time to remedy deficiencies, but in the case of the liberal arts students or others, who are fulfilling the language requirement, we may have only a total of six semester-hours to give them all we think they ought to have in what is likely to be their only college foreign-language course.

What, according to the college teachers, is therefore being sacrificed as a result of this alleged inadequate preparation on the high school level? The precise questions that were asked are: "If the high school products were as well prepared as you would like, what would you spend less time teaching in your college courses?" followed by the question: "More time?" The answer to the first was generally grammar and the other mechanical aspects of the languages. To the second the majority specified literature, with civilization, composition, and advanced conversation closely following. For the college teacher, then, utopia will have arrived the day the high school graduate comes to college with enough linguistic ability and intellectual maturity to be able to discuss and criticize in the foreign language the literary texts he will immediately be assigned to read. Until that day dawns a small minority, convinced of the futility of it all and persuaded that "the play's the thing" -- that is, that it is the ideas that count and not the language, will lecture in English, encourage the reading of translations, and make no attempt to require their students to express

(cont. next page)

themselves orally or in writing in the foreign tongue. The majority of the college teachers, however, will doggedly go on teaching the language skills their students lack, as they tediously elicit and correct ungrammatical and unphonetic responses given in the language they are trying to teach.

That this is a fact is borne out by the survey, which shows that except for the elementary course, where the figure is seventy per cent, almost one hundred per cent of the respondents say that the foreign language is the language of the classroom. It is also borne out by the response to the question: "In the instruction of your undergraduate majors on what phase of language study does your department place the greatest emphasis?" Almost fifty per cent of the respondents named language skills, with about thirty per cent naming literary texts and about twenty per cent literary history and criticism. One person named linguistics. It is clear from the comment of those who named language skills that they expect their majors to have a firm grasp of literature and literary history, the more so since about half of their majors go on to graduate school, which, say my college respondents, expects of their graduates a thorough grounding in literature and a well-developed critical faculty.

It is also evident from comments made on the returned questionnaires that there is dissatisfaction with the almost universal emphasis on literature in the curriculum of a foreign-language major. A minority voice maintains that too few American students have read enough in their own language to develop literary appreciation, that the audio-lingual emphasis in high school results in severely limited reading experience in the foreign language, that the average American undergraduate is not mature enough and lacks the background to comprehend much of the philosophical foundation of a literature course, that literature leaves our undergraduates cold and drives them away as majors, that a literature-centered curriculum is out of date, and so on. They urge that other options be provided our prospective language majors which might have more appeal to the youth of today.

Among the suggestions are area studies, which emphasize history, geography, and contemporary institutions. At Millersville, for example, we are presently engaged in organizing an inter-disciplinary (the word is very fashionable) program in Latin American Area Studies. The departments involved in organizing the program are History, Political Science, Economics, Geography, and Foreign Languages, and the objective is to prepare people to work as specialists in business and industry, government, international organizations, philanthropic foundations, and the like involving Latin America. From our point of view the particularly interesting factor is that the assumption which we as language teachers would consider as basic--that is, that to qualify as a specialist in anything related to Latin America fluency in Spanish or Portuguese is a *sine qua non*--is apparently going to be accepted by our colleagues in the other departments. We even have hopes that they will accept our proposal that half of the comprehensive final examination be oral and conducted in Spanish (or Portuguese) before a three-member jury. I simply give this as an illustration of how we can provide alternatives to our literature-centered foreign-language major which may have the advantage of avoiding the distasteful effort to force square pegs into round holes. By giving our students other options we may succed in saving as majors in our departments those who love language but hate literature. The dissatisfaction has not reached crisis proportions, but the study of language as literature appears to be on the defensive, and whether or not it holds its own as the purest essence of a foreign culture and the repository of its great ideas will depend on how effective our teachers are in reaching and inspiring a youth for whom reading has become almost a lost skill.

Another serious problem in the teaching of foreign languages is the difficulty of creating and maintaining an environment conducive to thinking in the language, which must be the goal of anyone wanting to be really fluent, especially our majors. We can, of course, send them abroad, but that is only for one of their four years,

(cont. next page)

and only a very limited few can go. We can establish language tables in the dining hall and language "houses"--if only wings or corridors in the dormitories--provided a friendly administration will allow us the funds for staff and provided we can find that kind of staff and, perhaps most important of all, provided the dean of men and the dean of women, especially the latter, believe in the idea and are willing to give their ungrudging cooperation.

But language houses are not enough. The problem lies in the fact that the student's six hours or so per week of foreign-language classes are only tiny oases in a vast desert of other courses and other activities in which English is the medium of communication. The student comes to our classes chatting with a companion in English from a physical education class conducted, of course, in English, and no sooner have the brain cells and nerve endings made the necessary adjustments to block out or by-pass English than the student leaves us for a history class or a biology lab where again, of course, the vehicle of communication is English. The whole process is reminiscent of a treadmill, where one must run merely to stay in place. We are experimenting at Millersville with five periods per week in class (in addition to the lab) in all our language courses (as distinct from literature and civilization) and for a number of years have offered intensive summer courses meeting three hours per day five days per week for six weeks, and the progress is noticeable.

It is so noticeable, in fact, as to suggest that for our majors we should perhaps reorganize our system so as to provide long, uninterrupted periods of concentration--immersion, if you will--in the foreign language. This idea has apparently been successful on the graduate level at such summer schools Middlebury and for the past two summers at our own residential summer school at Millersville and should certainly work as well for undergraduates--provided, of course, our colleges would dare to require foreign-language majors to go to school all summer for two or three summers. Another possibility, difficult to arrange, I must admit, would be to devote one whole academic year to nothing but foreign-language courses. Even more difficult to provide for would be a system under which a large number or all of the language major's non-language courses--such as, history, mathematics, psychology, etc. would be taught in the foreign language. Such a scheme unquestionably poses many problems, the most serious of which are cost and recruitment of staff, but it could be undertaken on a piecemeal basis. Perhaps, the ultimate solution will be the establishment of one college or university in the state existing solely for students of foreign languages all of whose courses will be taught in the various languages by natives who are specialists in their fields.

To return to the here and now, however, it is premature to talk about recruiting historians, mathematicians, and psychologists who are fluent in other languages, when it is becoming increasingly more difficult to find qualified people simply to teach our present offerings. Burgeoning enrollments are necessitating increases in staff, but our sources of supply, the graduate schools, are not keeping pace with our need for competent teachers. I emphasize these last two words, realizing, of course, that they are susceptible of differing interpretations. I do not think we would differ, however, on our insistence as a minimum requirement upon depth in subject matter to the extent of the master's degree and substantial progress toward the doctorate, and until pressure for alternatives to the literary specialty forces changes in the graduate curriculum, the subject matter will most likely be in the field of literature. That the graduate schools are successfully imparting to their future college teachers this depth in literature is not in question, and whether or not the future students of these future teachers will need or want it is for the present beside the point. That they are imparting competency in teaching in so far as competency in teaching can be imparted is in question.

At this point let me hasten to emphasize that I am not labeling all the products of all the graduate schools as incompetent teachers, any more than I would label all the products of all the teacher-training

(cont. next page)

institutions as good teachers. I am still of the persuasion that teaching is an art and that the best teachers are born, not made. This is not to say that I am not in favor of a structured teacher-preparation program for prospective college teachers. The fact is that I am, and the majority of my colleagues in the colleges who answered my questionnaire likewise said they were in favor of such a program. However, the unfortunate fact remains that in the average graduate school--and this is a generalization, to be treated as such--a systematic approach to teacher-preparation does not exist. It is true that the average graduate student will have varying amounts of experience in teaching university undergraduate classes, but he is generally thrown into the classroom to sink or swim, and he learns by trial and error--to the detriment of the poor guinea pigs on whom he is practising. Supervision by master teachers, if it exists, will be minimal and casual.

Does it really matter that so many going into college teaching have not been taught how to teach? The answer is a definite yes, as far as colleges like ours are concerned, where the majority of the language majors will be teachers, mostly on the high school level, but some also on the elementary level, and though a growing number will go straight on to graduate school, most of the rest will go into business, industry, or government work (like the Peace Corps), where speaking ability counts most. Thus our college instructors, though they will have an advanced literature or linguistic course or two to teach, must be capable of handling several sections of elementary or intermediate language classes, where the emphasis is on speaking and understanding. This means that they must be thoroughly grounded in applied linguistics and in the psychology of language learning. They must know how to keep up a fast-moving oral pace, keep the whole class active and involved, vary the menu to forestall fatigue and boredom, impart meaning by dramatics, and on occasion play the cheerleader to drive home a point of phonetics or syntax. They must also know how to make use of the language laboratory.

Now it is an unfortunate fact that the typical product of the graduate school does not at the present time receive this kind of training. He is likely to begin his teaching career with the image of his favorite university professors fresh in his memory, and he will at once proceed to imitate them even to the point of delivering the same lectures from notes assiduously taken in their courses. Having been so recently exposed to the lecture system, he is even likely to lecture on the fine points of grammar to his beginners' class. However, if he is genuinely interested in his students, it will not take him too long to discover that the lecture method has some severe limitations, particularly when it comes to motivating and keeping the interest of young people constantly exposed to activities far more exciting than learning a foreign language. Eventually by trial and error the neophyte will develop into a reasonably good teacher, but meanwhile a good many students will have paid the price of novice instruction. Since most smaller institutions like ours, which put a higher price on teaching than on research, cannot afford the price of novice instruction or the time for on-the-job training, we try to find experienced teachers to fill our openings. However, the law of supply and demand being inexorable and experienced language teachers becoming increasingly scarce, let us hope that the graduate schools will do us and their students a favor by instituting teacher-training programs which will in some measure help bridge the novice gap.

Numerous other problems in the area of foreign languages continue to plague us, but as I draw toward my conclusion, let me state that the foregoing represents an attempt to delineate only the ones brought into sharpest focus by my survey. As can be readily surmised, the list is not intended to be all-inclusive, and no doubt certain lacunae have already come to mind. However, in the interest of brevity value judgments had to be made concerning what to include and what to omit. Furthermore, my survey left out some important questions,

(cont. next page)

several by inadvertance, others by design either because they were not germane to the subject of articulation or because they were too complex to be answered on a questionnaire. I did not, for example, attempt to survey opinion on the use and usefulness of the language laboratory or on the controversy over the linguistic theories of the Chomsky school vis-a-vis those of John Carroll and others, a controversy which is presently sowing considerable confusion in our ranks. Nor did I have the opportunity to inquire into the deplorable abandonment of a number of Russian programs in our schools and colleges.

Also beyond the scope of my survey was the crisis in Latin, where a combination of teacher scarcity, use of poorly-prepared teachers, and the all-too-prevalent and self-defeating two-year sequence in the ninth and tenth grades, have led either to outright excision of Latin from the curriculum or to a predictable death by gradually declining enrollments. Fortunately, the more enlightened of our classicist colleagues are aware of the problems and in order to appeal more to the interest of today's teenagers are promoting reforms in their curriculum to include authors like Plautus, Terence, Catullus, and Martial at the expense of the traditional sequence of Caesar, Cicero, and Vergil. In their methodology, following in the wake of Waldo Sweet's pioneering efforts, they are treating Latin less as a code to be deciphered, less as an intellectual challenge to the high I.Q.'s, and more as system of phonemes to be uttered and heard by children of all I.Q.'s, with structural drills replacing tedium. In their attempts to break the death grip of the ninth-and-tenth-grade sequence the more idealistic of their numbers are proposing a six-year sequence in grades seven to twelve, and the more realistic a three-year sequence in grades nine to twelve, with most of them apparently agreeing that there should be a Latin sequence in the latter years of high school. The Latin crisis is far from being over, and it is the duty of the modern-language teachers to give our friends in Latin all the support we can muster, for their loss will eventually be ours.

Here, then, to conclude, are some of the major unresolved problems facing us as teachers of foreign languages. To some I have suggested an answer. The rest I leave to others to solve. To a few of these the solution may be just around the corner; for solutions to others we may not live that long. It is possible, too, that some of today's problems may simply become irrelevant, as scientific discoveries and technological advances produce radical changes in our approach to the teaching of languages. Developments in cybernetics may change our role from teacher to programmer. Instant world-wide communication by television may make it possible for our language students to be present, figuratively speaking, at foreign university courses, the theater, lectures, religious services, political rallies, festivals, celebrations, group discussions, social and sports events--the list is endless. Or supersonic-rapid transportation may make it possible for these same students to be present, this time literally speaking, at those same events. With our students able to commute daily from this country to universities anywhere else in the wide world and foreign professors commuting daily from abroad to colleges and universities anywhere in the United States a good many of us will be out of a job, and then we will really have problems!